Attorney Docket No.: 128596

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Micant: Scott Mordin Hoyte, et al.

Serial No. 10/722,771

Group Art Unit: 2858

Filed: November 26, 2003

Examiner: Marina Kramskaya

For:

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR MULTI-FREQUENCY INDUCTIVE RATIO

MEASUREMENT

Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### **TRANSMITTAL**

1. Transmitted herewith is:
Transmittal (3 pages); Response to Restriction Requirement (2 pages); Postcard

#### **STATUS**

2. Applicant

claims small entity status.
is other than a small entity.

# CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Express Mail No. EV593390260US

Date: February 17, 2005

I hereby certify that the documents listed above are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AMENOMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Robert B. Reeser, III, Reg. No. 45,548

# EXTENSION OF TERM

3.	apply.											
	(complete (a) or (b), as applicable)											
	(a)	Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136  (Fees: 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:)										
		Extension for response within:	Other than small entity Fee	Small entity Fee (if applicable)								
		first month	\$ 120.00	\$ 60.00								
		second month	\$ 450.00	\$ 225.00								
		third month	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 510.00								
		fourth month	\$1,590.00	\$ 795.00								
		fifth month	\$2,160.00	\$1,080.00								
			Fee:	\$								
If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor.												
(Check and complete the next item, if applicable)												
An extension of months has already been secured. The fee paid therefor \$ is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of extension now requested.												
	Extension fee due with this request \$											
	OR											
	(b) X Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, to conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for ext of time.											

## FEE FOR CLAIMS

	(Co	ol. 1)		(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)	SMALL ENTITY		OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT				HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	ADDITIONAL RATE FEE	OR	ADDITIONAL RATE FEE				
TOTAL	1		MINUS		=	x \$25.00 == \$		x \$50.00 = \$				
INDEP.			MINUS		=	x \$100.00 ≔ \$	!	x \$200.00 = S				
	FIRS	r Presen	TATION OF	MULTIPLE DEP.	CLAIM	+ \$180.00 = \$		+ \$360.00 = \$				
						TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE \$	OR	TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE \$				
	(a)	$\boxtimes$	No add	itional fee fo	r Claims i			,				
					OR							
	(b)  Total additional fee for claims required \$											
				FEE :	PAYMEN	T						
5.	Attached is a check in the sum of \$											
		Charge Deposit Account No. 01-2384 the sum of \$ A duplicate of this transmittal is attached.										
				FEE D	EFICIEN	CY						
6. If any additional extension and/or fee is required, charge Deposit According 12384.								sit Account No.				
	AND/OR											
	If any additional fee for claims is required, charge Deposit Account No. 0 2384.											
7.		Other:			Re AF	bert B. Reeser, UT g. No. 45,548 MSTRONG TEAS e Metropolitan Squa						
					St.	Louis, MO 63102	шс, о	uite 2000				
					31	4-621-5070						



## IN THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Applicant: Scott Mordin Hoyte, et al.

Serial No. 10/722,771 : Group Art Unit: 2858

Filed: November 26, 2003 : Examiner: Marina Kramskaya

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR MULTI-

FREQUENCY INDUCTIVE RATIO

MEASUREMENT

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action mailed January 28, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the following amendment has been made in consequence thereof. In response to the election requirement set forth in the Office Action, Applicants elect for prosecution in this application all claims of Group I identified in the Office Action. Claims 1-8 are in the elected claim group.

The restriction requirement is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Groups I, II and III clearly are related. It is believed that a thorough search and examination of either claim group would be relevant to the examination of the other group. In addition, requirements for restriction are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Reese III

Reg. No. 45,548

Armstrong Teasdale LLP

One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, MO 63012

(314) 621-5070